



Wilks, Tim. (2010). 'The Statuette'. In: Nicholas Lanier, 1588–1666. A Portrait Revealed. Mark Weiss, London, pp. 60-69.

Downloaded from <http://ssudl.solent.ac.uk/1550/>

Usage Guidelines

Please refer to usage guidelines at <http://ssudl.solent.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact ir.admin@solent.ac.uk.



38
~ detail of the statuette

THE STATUETTE ~ *Tim Wilks*

The statuette (fig.38) which is set prominently upon the table, and two pictures in the background, each full of detail, turn the Lanier portrait into a complex and enigmatic work. Whereas these inclusions would have been perfectly comprehensible to those who first enjoyed the portrait, they now present the viewer with an intriguing challenge. The sitter is neither holding nor looking at the statuette, yet it is evident that it constitutes an essential element of the painting.¹ If only momentarily, the lute player's gaze has been diverted from the object set before him to the viewer. We cannot tell whether the sitter has been playing and *singing* about the statuette, or *to* it. Perhaps the small figure is listening, but if so, he does not deign to acknowledge the musician; instead, his casual glance is directed downward to the piece of paper resting beside it.

This is not a portrait in which one piece of classical sculpture would serve as well as another, simply to indicate the sitter's sophistication. Neither is it a portrait of the kind in which antiquities are included only to be recognised as the sitter's possessions, as in Lotto's *Andrea Odoni*² (1527). Another early example of the 'collector portrait' is Francesco Salviati's *Portrait of a Member of the Santacroce Family* (1530–38) (fig.39),³ in which a single sculptural group – an *Amazon Mounted on a Fallen Horse* – may be seen on the table behind the sitter. A work of the next generation, Alessandro Allori's *Portrait of a Young Man* (c.1560),⁴ includes a replica of an *Apollo Citharoedos*, then owned by the dellaValle family in Rome. In contrast to Allori's airy setting, Titian, with his *Jacopo Strada* (fig.40),⁵ admits the viewer into the collector's *studiolo* to witness Strada's passion for his objects; there he holds out a statuette of *Venus* to be admired, while a male torso lies on the table. Still more intimate is Veronese's *Alessandro Vittoria*,⁶ which belongs to a related group of portraits in which sculptors and architects, rather than collectors, are shown with sculpture: Vittoria presents to the viewer a plaster *modello* of his St Sebastian, while an antique torso lies on the table. Vittoria, again holding a figure, is the sitter in a portrait by Moroni,⁷ and in Veronese's *Vincenzo Scamozzi*, the architect indicates the proportions of his carved model of a Corinthian capital.⁸ Vittoria's St Sebastian reappears in Palma Giovane's *Portrait of a Collector* (fig.41), in which the sitter is surrounded by pieces of sculpture including a bust of Vitellius.⁹ Although the statuette in the Lanier portrait serves a somewhat different function to the sculpture in these examples, it is in various ways indebted to this important but understudied portrait genre of the *seicento*,¹⁰ which is traceable at least to Parmigianino.¹¹

The appearance of identifiable, classical sculpture, even in the form of small replicas, is highly unusual in English portraiture of this date – possibly unprecedented. A Nathaniel Bacon *Self-portrait* in which the sitter holds a small *Pallas Athene*, appears to have been painted after the Lanier portrait, around 1619. Only with Van Dyck's *Continence of Scipio*, painted probably in 1620, and his still later *Portrait of George Gage* did English art (in so far as Van Dyck may be regarded as having assumed responsibility for it) begin to participate in the pictorial exploration of the relationship of an individual to sculpture. This had been very much an Italian, principally a Venetian, inquiry, different in character to the Antwerp passion for *Kunstammer* interiors exemplified by the work of Willem van Haecht, Frans Francken the Younger, Jan Breughel the Elder, and later, Teniers, though Rembrandt's *Aristotle with a Bust of Homer* (1653)¹³ reminds us that the Dutch came to understand the exercise perfectly. Lanier's commission, made soon after his return from Venice, seems to have been inspired by the portrait genre he had discovered there, pos-

1. This is confirmed by Dr Katherine Ara's technical examination, which has revealed that the statuette (also the pen and paper) is painted directly onto the imprimatura, with the green of the tablecloth painted up to its outline.
2. Royal Collection, RCIN 405776. Recognisable pieces are a replica of the *Hercules and Antaeus*, a *Hercules*, a *Venus*, and in the sitter's hand, a small *Diana of Ephesus*.
3. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, inv. 296.
4. Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, inv. A1123.
5. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, inv. GG-81.
6. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. 46.31.
7. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, inv. GG-78.
8. Denver Art Museum, Denver.
9. City Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham, inv. 1961P48.
10. Surprisingly few art historians have paused to give broad consideration to this Renaissance portrait type; see most recently *Titien, Tintoret, Véronèse... Rivalités à Venise*, ed. V. Delieuvin and J. Habert, Louvre exhib., Paris, 2009, pp. 178–213; also, David Ekserdjian, *Parmigianino*, New Haven and London, 2006, p. 121; Manfred Riesel, 'Betrachtungen zu zwei Porträts: Tizian: Jacopo de Strada und Lorenzo Lotto: Andrea Odoni', in *Müssen wir alles glauben, was man uns erzählt?* Kritische Betrachtungen zu Darstellungen in der Kunst, Frankfurt/M., 1998. Employing a strictly iconographical approach is Phyllis Bober and Ruth Rubinstein, *Renaissance Artists and Antique Sculpture*, revised edn., Turnhout, 2009.
11. National Gallery, London, NG6441. The sculptural group shown in the background of Parmigianino's *Portrait of a Man*, however, is more the product of Renaissance invention than antiquity.
12. Karen Hearn, *Nathaniel Bacon. Artist, Gentleman, and Gardener*, Tate Britain exhib., London, 2005, pp. 12–13.
13. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. 61.198.



sibly in the Tintoretto studio, to which visitors to the English embassy were routinely directed by Sir Henry Wotton and his successor, Sir Dudley Carleton.¹⁴

At the time the portrait was painted, an Italian bronze statuette would have been an expensive commodity in northern Europe, affordable only by a man of great means and only appropriate for display in the house of such a person. More probably, therefore, the statuette in the painting is copied from, and represents, a plaster replica, though it may have been painted to resemble bronze.¹⁵ Indeed, a crack, characteristic of the painter's eye for detail, runs from the figure's right foot across the base. Such objects were bought by those who could not afford the far more exclusive bronzes, but were no less informative. The best terracotta work was of a different order; highly collectable and sometimes as costly as bronze.¹⁶ In Rome, probably sometime in the 1620s, a young François Duquesnoy modelled in terracotta a copy of the *Antinous*, probably taking many weeks to complete it.¹⁷ It is unlikely that he was the first sculptor to have copied the statue in this medium. Smaller terracotta works may also have been fashioned, though the acquisition of such a fragile object by an itinerant musician seems unlikely.

Exploration of all these possibilities is certainly important, but should be incidental to the main concern, which must be with the image (however derived) of the statuette in the portrait. If the image of the statuette is not simply indicative of a reverence for the Antique but is a deliberately chosen, identifiable piece, then, its identity is clearly significant and important. If, as we suspect, the route to a deeper understanding of the portrait lies through the statuette, its identity becomes nothing less than crucial.



14. For example, Jacopo Tintoretto, *Giovanni Paolo Cornaro (delle Anticaglie)* (1561), Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Gand; Jacopo Tintoretto, *Ottavio Strada* (1567/8), Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Domenico Titoretto, *Portrait of a Sculptor (Ascanio de' Christì?)*, (c.1590), Alte Pinakothek, Munich; Domenico Tintoretto, *Portrait of a Sculptor*, sold, Koller, Zurich, 19 September, 2008.

15. Note, however, the greyish colour of the bronze copy attributed to Guglielmo della Porta in the Detroit Institute of Arts.

16. According to Bellori, Cardinal Camillo Masimi paid 400 scudi for Duquesnoy's terracotta *Laocöon*, see Estelle Lingo, *François Duquesnoy and the Greek Ideal*, New Haven and London, 2007, p. 13.

17. Ibid., pp. 12–13.

19. Ulisse Aldrovandi: 'Delle Statue Antiche, che per tutta Roma, in diversi luoghi, & case si veggono' in Lucio Mauro, *Le Antichità della Città di Roma*, Venice, 1556, p. 151; see Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, New Haven and London, 1981, p. 143, note 36.

20. Ibid., pp. 141–3. Although Stosch identified the statue as Mercury as early as 1724, it was only after Visconti came to the same conclusion in the early nineteenth century that this re-identification gained general acceptance. See also Christopher W. Clairmont, *Die Bildnisse des Antinous*, Rome, 1966; Peter Gerlach, 'Warum hiess der "Hermes-Andros" des Vatikanischen Belvedere "Antinous" ', in *Il Cortile delle statue. Der Statuenhof des Belvedere im Vatikan*, ed. Matthias Winner et al., Mainz, 1998, pp. 355–78.

21. N.B., Charles I would not obtain his own full-scale bronze copy until Hubert Le Sueur cast it from moulds obtained in Rome in 1631, and erected it at Greenwich; see David Howarth, 'Charles I, Sculpture and Sculptors' in Arthur MacGregor (ed.), *The Late King's Goods*, London and Oxford, 1989, pp. 73–113 (83–4).

The intended viewers of the portrait would have had no difficulty in recognizing the figure as Antinous; the statuette being a small replica of the life-size *Belvedere Antinous*, which had been purchased in 1543 by Pope Paul III not long after its discovery in the vicinity of Rome, and set up in the Belvedere courtyard of the Vatican to complete an unsurpassable collection of Antique statuary.¹⁸ Another version had been part of the private Farnese collection since 1546, and had also been drawn and engraved before the Lanier portrait was painted.¹⁹ Indeed, it was only much later, after the Farnese version (which, tellingly, wears winged sandals and holds a caduceus) was compared with the Vatican version, that a firm re-identification as *Mercury (Hermes)* became possible.²⁰ Yet, it seems that until the eighteenth century the Farnese version received much less attention and its appearance did not compromise the copied, recopied, and disseminated image of the much more famous *Belvedere Antinous*. (fig.42) Mutations to the image of the *Belvedere Antinous* in the seventy years between 1543 and 1613 occur within a self-contained iconography, of which the image in the Lanier portrait is part. The familiarity of the *Belvedere Antinous* was also significantly increased in northern Europe after Primaticcio had cast his bronze copy for François I in the late 1540. Thereafter, all foreigners staying in Paris for their education would at some point make the trip to Fontainebleau where they would see the statue.²¹

As early as the late 1550s, Giovan Battista Cavalieri engraved the *Belvedere Antinous*, the print being included as one of fifty-eight illustrations in his *Antiquarum Statuarum Urbis Romae Liber Primus* (Rome, 1555–61). Already, the image of the statue shows it restored; that is, with both arms and hands attached. This publication was reprinted without changes



by Girolamo Porro in Venice in 1570. The same plate of the *Belvedere Antinous*, though apparently re-cut, was next used for an enlarged publication, of one hundred illustrations, bearing the same title that appeared no later than 1584.²² In that same year, another, similar compilation was published: *Antiquarum Statuarum Urbis Romae....Icones ex typis Laurentij Vaccarij 1584*, which necessarily included the highly regarded *Belvedere Antinous*. Lorenzo Vaccaro's engraving, however, lacks the graceful sway of Cavalieri's version, and the over-defined abdominal muscles betray Vaccaro's insensitivity to the supple beauty of the original.

Such engravings would have been available to our painter in the folio sets sold by specialist booksellers in the major *entrepôts* of Europe. Although the *Belvedere Antinous* in the Lanier portrait is viewed from much the same angle as the Cavalieri and Vaccaro engravings its subdued mannerism seems to be derived from another source. Leaving aside sculpture, which remains the most probable source type, it is only in master drawings, such as the superb study by Hendrik Goltzius, that one finds the *Antinous* well enough modelled to provide a guide worthy for the portrait's statuette.²³ We might pause our search with the observation that the painter has taken as much

care with the statuette as with any part of the portrait. As a study in itself, it amounts to little short of *ekphrasis*: a revelation of the special qualities of one art form by another.

In 1559/60 (close to the time of its first engraving), the sculptor Willem Tetrode cast for his patron, Cosimo I de' Medici, a fine bronze statuette of the *Belvedere Antinous*, 57 centimetres. tall, intended for a set of cabinet replicas of the most celebrated examples of Antique statuary.²⁴ For a period in the 1570s or 1580s, Pietro da Barga was similarly engaged for another Medici patron, Cardinal Ferdinando de' Medici. His bronze copy of the *Belvedere Antinous* stands 28.7 centimetres tall, and may be the source from which a plaster version, depicted in the portrait, ultimately derived.²⁵ Another bronze copy, possibly an even better candidate, is a more tousle-haired, mannerist interpretation attributed to Guglielmo della Porta, 34.6 centimetres in height, which may also be dated to the second half of the sixteenth century.²⁶ Fine Italian examples of this period, as much as 66 centimetres in height are also known.²⁷

In his *Antiquatis Urbis* of 1527, Andrea Fulvio noted the recent discovery of a statue, which may be the first published report of the *Belvedere Antinous*, and declared without qualification that it represented Hadrian's Antinous.²⁸ In doing so, he, like other *cognoscenti* in Clement VII's Rome who hurried to inspect the work, having been confronted by a superb rendering of the classical ideal of male beauty, immediately recalled that youth whom the Emperor Hadrian had so greatly loved. These *cinquecento* scholars clearly knew the canon of classical texts well enough to know of this Antinous, even though only a single line in the *Historia Augusta* is devoted to him, and scarcely more in Cassius Dio; these being the only near-contemporary sources. From them, we learn only that Antinous perished while the imperial party was sailing along the Nile, whereupon Hadrian 'wept like a woman',²⁹ and that later the grieving emperor built 'a city on the spot where he had suffered his fate and naming it after him; and he also set up statues, or rather sacred images of him, practically all over the world.'³⁰ It was this last piece of information which kept Renaissance excavators on the lookout for likely Antinouses, and which encouraged the identification of the Belvedere Antinous when it was found.

Though the identification of the Vatican statue as Antinous was never more than speculative, it gained widespread acceptance. Certainly, the documents concerned with Primaticcio's visit to Rome in order to obtain a mould refer to it only as the *Antinous*.³¹ Cavalieri, the statue's first engraver, however, offered an alternative: *Milo*, the legendary 6th century BC athlete, who was given precedence in the inscription: 'Milo aliis Antinous in hortis Pont. in Vaticano'. This was repeated in the inscription to Vaccaro's engraving, and both prints retained their original wording as long as the plates were used, which in both cases continued well beyond the date when the Lanier portrait was painted.³² Franzini's much cruder woodcut, for what it is worth, offers only the Antinous identification, but it is in seventeenth-century prints which post-date the portrait, such as François Perrier's etching of 1638,³³ Jan de Bisschop's etchings after Willem Doudijns's drawings,³⁴ or Thourneyser's and Perrier's etchings after Sandrart's studies,³⁵ that we gain confirmation of the falling away of alternative identifications; all these refer only to Antinous. As far as viewers in the early seventeenth century were concerned, the Belvedere statue and all its copies represented Antinous.

If we suppose the statuette in the portrait signifies a contemporary figure, we might consider the dominant court personality of 1613: Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset (fig.42). James I lifted him out of obscurity, doted upon him, then lost him. For a continuation of the parallel with Antinous and Hadrian, it would be convenient for Somerset to have drowned in the Thames, but he did not. Instead, in late 1613, he married (with the King's blessing) Frances Howard, and it is amid their wedding celebrations that Lanier's reappearance and performance is recorded. Even had this occasion given new impetus to Lanier's career, it is questionable whether such a portrait, evidently for private contemplation, would have focused on this Scottish favourite of little intellect, and, if so, whether it would have been prudent to use a Roman emperor's catamite to represent him. After all, George Chapman, having published his celebratory poem on the marriage, *Andromeda Liberata*, had to refute the obvious interpretation that the cuckolded 3rd Earl of Essex was the barren rock from which Frances Howard (Andromeda) had been freed. In Somerset we may not have our man, but, more crucially, we may not even have the right Antinous.

22. *Antiquarum / Statuarum / Urbis / Romae / Primus et Secundus / Liber / Ludovico Madruco / S.R.E. Card. Amplissimo / Dic. Io. Baptista De Caval / Ieriis Authore* (Rome, n.d., but after 1561–before 1584); see Thomas Ashby, 'Antiquae Statuae Urbis Romae', in *Papers of the British School at Rome*, IX (1920), pp. 107–58.
23. Teyler's Stichting, Haarlem, inv. K III 22 r; see Emil Karel Josef Reznicek, *Hendrik Goltzius als Zeichner*, Utrecht 1961, pp. 91, 200, no. 205; Aurelia Brandt, 'Goltzius and the Antique', *Print Quarterly*, XVIII, (2), 135–49.
24. Florence, Bargello, inv. 1879, no. 208; see Anna Maria Massinelli (ed.), *Bronzetti e Anticaglie dalla Guardaroba di Cosimo I, Mostre del Museo Nazionale di Bargello*, Florence, 1991, p. 91, fig. 76.
25. Ferrara, Museo Civico, inv. C.G.F. 8532; see *Plachette e bronzi nelle Civiche Collezioni*, (catalogo della mostra Ferrara, Palazzina di Marfisa d'Este, luglio–ottobre 1974, Pomposa, Palazzo della Ragione, luglio–agosto 1975), Firenze 1975, p. 156, no. 147. Other examples are in the Bargello, Florence, see Giacomo De Nicola, 'Notes on the Museo Nazionale of Florence. II: A Series of Small Bronzes by Pietro da Barga', *Burlington Magazine*, XXIX (1916), pp. 363–73; also Galleria Nazionale, Perugia.
26. Detroit Institute of Arts, inv. 40–119; see Peter Gerlach, 'Eine Hand von Guglielmo della Porta? Cavaliere, Tetrode, Perret und der sogen Antinous von Belvedere' in *De Arte et Libris. Festschriftj Erasmus 1934–1984*, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 179ff.
27. For example, CensusID 46014.
28. Andrea Fulvio [Andreas Fulvius], *Antiquatis Urbis* (Rome, 1527), book 3, fol. xxxvii verso B.
29. 'Antinoum suum, dum per Nilum navigat, perdidit, quem muliebriter flevit', *De Vita Hadriani Aelii Spartiani*, XIV, 4.
30. Dio further speculates that Hadrian 'honoured Antinous, either because of his love for him or because the youth had voluntarily undertaken to die (it being necessary that a life should be surrendered freely for the accomplishment of the ends Hadrian had in view), by building a city on the spot where he had suffered his fate and naming it after him'. Cassius Dio, *Roman History*, ed. and trans. E. Cary, 9 vols, (Harvard, 1914–27), VIII, pp. 445–47.
31. Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, p. 141.
32. 'Milo alys Antinous Roma in vaticano'.
33. François Perrier, *Segmenta nobilium Signorum et Statuarum, Quae temporis dentem invidium evasere* (Rome, 1638), tav. 53.
34. Jan de Bisschop, *Signorum Veterum Icones* (L'Aia, 1668–1669), tav. 12 and 13.

42
Hermes, called
The Belvedere Antinous
2nd century AD
© Museums and Galleries, Vatican
City, Rome/ Alinari/
The Bridgeman Art Library

The *Historia Augusta*, with its brief account of Hadrian’s Antinous, was not widely known or available to English Renaissance readers, and even after Isaac Casaubon’s edition was published in Paris in 1603 and again in 1609,³⁶ only keen classicists would have encountered this Antinous in its pages. A contemporary of Casaubon, another great French scholar (and antiquary), Nicolas Fabri de Peiresc, was certainly familiar with the story of Hadrian’s Antinous, as he noted the appropriateness of the image of Antinous (who in death had been proclaimed a demi-god) on the side of a demi-cyathe that was in his collection.³⁷ Casaubon and Peiresc were, however, exceptional *érudits*, and hardly typical even of the classically educated aristocracy and gentry of the period.

When an educated Elizabethan or a Jacobean heard the name ‘Antinous’, the character who would first spring to mind was not Hadrian’s lover but the equally handsome and attractive Antinous of Homer’s *Odyssey*. This may be deduced from the absence of references to Hadrian’s Antinous in contemporary literature, in marked contrast to the persistent degree of attention that Homer’s Antinous receives. It would be wise therefore, to recall Haskell’s and Penny’s observation that Antinous was ‘a title frequently given to figures of male youths’,³⁸ and Fizdale’s that Ben Jonson, in *Volpone*, may have been thinking of both Antinouses simultaneously.³⁹ We might even suspect that Hadrian’s Bithynian lover was given the name in adolescence for his resemblance to the Homeric character. Such shifts and ambiguities were easily accepted and dealt with by the Jacobean mind, and, therefore, in the case of the statuette in the portrait, we should similarly be prepared to contemplate an alternative identity under the same name.⁴⁰

Undoubtedly, the most prominent literary reference to Antinous published in the few years immediately preceding the painting of the Lanier portrait is that found in Ben Jonson’s *Volpone, or the Fox*, a play which was a success from its first London performance in 1606. Its text appeared in print in 1607/8. The reference to Antinous is made during Volpone’s attempted seduction of Corvino’s wife, Celia:

I am now as fresh,/ As hot, as high, and in as iouviall plight,
As when... / I acted young ANTINOUS, and attracted
The eyes and eares of all the ladies present,
T’admire each graceful gesture, note and footing (III.vii. 157–64)

Deceived by the modern interest in Hadrian’s Antinous, literary scholars had until recently assumed it is to him that Volpone refers,⁴¹ but it has now been established that he refers to Homer’s Antinous.⁴² More particularly, it has been argued persuasively that Jonson was referring to a play that had actually been performed, one that was sufficiently well-known for the allusion to be picked up by Jonson’s audience, and one to which he wished to pay passing homage. That play was William Gager’s *Ulysses Redux*, which had provoked a controversy of its own, by using young gentlemen (students) in inappropriate roles (not least, female ones) when it was performed in Oxford in 1592.⁴³ Importantly, Gager brought the *Odyssey* (in Latin) to an English audience and readership prior to George Chapman’s complete translation of Homer from the Greek; indeed, Gager’s production may have helped to convince Chapman that he should take on the immense task. Following the publication of Chapman’s *Iliads* in 1611, a first printing of his *Homer’s Odysseys* seems to have taken place in 1614.⁴⁴ Publication of the *Whole Works of Homer* followed in 1616. The proofing and printing of *Homer’s Odysseys* would have

been lengthy and laborious, and in London’s gathering places there would have been talk of the progress of the work during 1613. All this pre-publication activity would have brought the epic’s characters, among them Antinous, back into the imaginations of patrons and practitioners of the arts.

It is possible, therefore, to trace a growing enthusiasm for the *Odyssey* to Gager’s time, if not before. It became such that newly written amplifications and extensions to Homer’s narrative were not thought presumptuous but were eagerly received. Within this process, Antinous, the foremost of the suitors of Ulysses’ wife, Penelope – irresistible, it would seem, to all women but the faithful Penelope – became a more rounded, complex and, arguably, sympathetic character in English Renaissance poetry and drama. As late as 1619, an Antinous (this time, a son of Cassilane) appears in *The Laws of Candy*, a tragi-comedy now attributed to John Ford (1586–1640). This Antinous is entirely divorced from the narrative of the *Odyssey*, but retains the essential characteristic of one so-named in that he is irresistibly handsome.⁴⁵

While the memory of *Ulysses Redux* persisted into the first decade of James I’s reign, Sir John Davies’s *Orchestra*, though first published in 1596, remained very current.⁴⁶ Neither the author nor the London publishers had yet done with it, and its concerns with dance and its music were still very relevant to the court culture of Jacobean England, which attached great importance to the masque, in which so many of the arts were combined. *Orchestra* would be re-published in 1618 and 1622, with a dedication to ‘The Prince’, which, curiously, does not mention Charles by name, and its fulsome description of the dedicatee’s physical accomplishments arouses a suspicion that this dedication had been written much earlier, around 1612, with Prince Henry in mind. It appears even to contain a reference to the elder prince’s acclaimed performance in *Prince Henries Barriers*.⁴⁷

And hence it is, that all your youthful traine
In activeness, and grace, YOU do excel
When YOU doe courtly dauncings entertaine,
Then Dauncing’s praise may be presented well⁴⁸

Around 1612, Davies is known to have hankered for a recall from Ireland where he had served for several years as, first, Solicitor-General, then Attorney-General, and when his long-term patron, Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury died in May of that year, he may have re-directed his attentions to Prince Henry; certainly, its dedication suggests that Orchestra was being prepared for re-publication at about this time. The subsequent demise of Prince Henry in November, 1612, left Davies, like Lanier and many others, uncertain as to his future.⁴⁹

Purporting to fill in what Homer ‘had forgot’, Davies gives many lines to Antinous, creating a subtle and intelligent character who, besides wooing Penelope,⁵⁰ has the task of defending the practice of dancing.⁵¹ Lanier would have found the argument of Orchestra fascinating, and would have empathised with the Phæmius character, deriving reassurance from this ‘sacred singer’ of the solo voice’s special role in conveying truths, even to audiences in a royal court. We are told that Antinous was –

45. Antinous demands a bronze statue from the state of Candy (Crete) to honour his father, but this, as with other elements of the plot, appears to have been derived from Cinthio’s *Gli Hecatommithi* (1565), and has nothing to do with the iconography of Antinous.
46. *The Complete Poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. A. B. Grosart, 2 vols (1876), I, 155–212.
47. See John Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*, 4 vols (London, 1828), II, 270; also letter: T. Edmondes to W. Trumbull, 20 December, 1609, *HMC Downshire II*, p. 199.
48. Davies’s editor, Grosart, judges that it was ‘Most probably the former’ of the two princes that Davies addressed, see *Complete Poems*, I, 160, note 1.
49. Given the Speaker’s chair in the Irish Parliament of May 1613, Davies settled in to another period of Irish service, retiring to England in 1619, see Sean Kelsey, ‘Davies, Sir John (*bap.* 1569, d. 1626)’, ODNB.
50. In conjunction with Davies’s Orchestra, Peter Colse’s *Penelopes Complaint: or, A Mirrour for wanton Minions* (London, 1596) should be considered. This work provides a link between the Antinous tradition and the ‘Complaint’ genre in English Renaissance literature.
51. I. 136–200; 201–230; 460–491; 844–898; 1047–53

35. Joachim von Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie 1675* (Nuremberg, 1675), II, tav. aa; *Sculpture Veteris Admiranda* (Nuremberg, 1680), 5, tav. d.

36. Isaac Casaubon, *Historiæ Augustæ scriptores sex*, (Paris, 1603; also, printed in P. de la Rovière, *Historiæ Romanæ scriptores Latini veteres, etc.* tom. 2 (Paris, 1609).

37. Peter N. Miller, ‘History of religion becomes ethnology: some evidence from Peiresc’s Africa’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67.4 (2006): 675–96.

38. Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, p. 141.

39. Tay Fizdale, ‘Jonson’s Volpone and the “Real” Antinous’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, xxvi (1973), pp. 453–9.

40. On the Jacobean’s metaphysical turn of mind, and its predilection for resemblances and paradoxes, and aversion to fixed form, that affected music as well as poetry (and, it might be added, the visual arts) see the excellent David Pinto, ‘The Fantasy Manner: the seventeenth-century context’, *Chelys. The Journal of the Viola da Gamba Society*, X (1981), pp. 17–28.

41. Cf. *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925–1952), IX, p. 718.

42. The debate is found in: T. W. Craik, ‘Volpone’s Young Antinous’, *Notes & Queries* ccxv (1970), 213–14; Tay Fizdale, ‘Jonson’s Volpone and the “Real” Antinous’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, xxvi (1973), pp. 453–9; J. L. Simmons, ‘Volpone as Antinous: Jonson and “Th’ overthrow of Stage-Plays”’, *The Modern Language Review*, 70, No. 1 (Jan., 1975), pp. 13–19; Michael J. Warren, ‘A Note on Jonson’s *Volpone*, I, i, 76–8’, *Notes & Queries* ccxcv (1980), pp. 143–6; T. W. Craik, ‘Volpone’s Young Antinous Again’, *Notes & Queries*, 29 (2), (1982), pp. 140–1; Richmond Barbour, ‘When I Acted Young Antinous’: Boy Actors and the Erotics of Jonsonian Theater’, *PMLA*, 110, No. 5 (Oct., 1995), pp. 1006–22.

43. Gager has been judged ‘probably the most talented of the Oxford playwrights’, see J. W. Binns, ‘Gager, William (1555–1622)’, ODNB.

44. G. Chapman, *Homer’s Odysseys Translated according to ye Greeke*, London, 1614?; 1615), (STC 13636 and 13637).

Amongst the wooers, who were silent set,
To hear a poet sing the sad retrea
The Greeks perform'd from Troy; which was from thence (495)
Proclaim'd by Pallas, pain of her offence.

Here, we might recall the statuette seeming to listen to the lutenist’s ayre. Had the English recently made a sad withdrawal from a foreign shore, or would such an analogy be too simple? The Greeks, though victorious at Troy, had lost heroes, foremost among them, Achilles, and Ulysses, also, had not returned.

.
The unseen but essential player in the Lanier portrait may be a Penelope-figure, who, in Davies’s account,

When which divine song was perceived to bear
That mournful subject by the listening ear

– intrudes, and re-directs:

She chid the sacred singer: ‘Phæmius,
You know a number more of these great deeds
Of Gods and men, that are the sacred seeds,
And proper subjects, of a poet’s song,
And those due pleasures that to men belong,
Besides these facts that furnish Troy’s retreat,

Sing one of those to these, that round your seat
They may with silence sit, and taste their wine;
But cease this song, that through these ears of mine
Conveys deserv’d occasion to my heart
Of endless sorrows...

Phæmius having upset Penelope, faces the anger of the wooers, but finds a defender in Telemachus:

Enjoy me in your banquets, see ye lay
These loud notes down, nor do this man the wrong,
Because my mother hath disliked his song,

Davies suggests thereby a kind of immunity for the singer-poet. It is Antinous (here portrayed as a good listener, though not an uncritical one), who releases the tension by acknowledging the force of Telemachus’s words:

‘Telemachus! / The Gods, I think, have rapt thee to this height
Of elocution, and this great conceit / Of self-ability’.

Like the Trojan War, the long Dutch war of independence had been characterized by sieges. Following the truce of 1609, many English career-soldiers had returned, and the unemployed captain had become a familiar type in London society. For many, England had become a kind of Ithaca without Ulysses, particularly since the untimely death of the

energetic and inspirational Prince Henry. It might be asked (in search of further parallels) whether the English had lost an outstanding hero, an Achilles, in the Netherlands; the response to which must be that it was Sir Philip Sidney, who had died in 1586 from a wound suffered at the siege of Zutphen.

National reverence for Sidney, the epitome of virtue, had been sustained through the successive waves of adulation for Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, and Prince Henry, not least through the determination of Sidney’s sister, Mary, Countess of Pembroke, who patronised a literary circle that had included Davies. It was in 1613 that the cult of Sidney was reinvigorated by the republication of the ‘New’ *Arcadia*, twenty years after the Countess (to whom the work had been dedicated) had supported an edition of the revised manuscript on which Sidney had worked in the early 1580s.⁵² This first Jacobean edition of the *Arcadia* also included Sidney’s *Defence of Poesy*. Also in 1613, Gervase Markham published *The second and last part of the first booke of the English Arcadia*, which continued in the vein of Sidney’s work.⁵³ Evidence that Lanier was at some point connected to the Herbert-Sidney sphere of patronage is given in the younger John Donne’s prefatory remarks to his 1660 edition of the poems of Sidney’s nephew and the Countess’s son, William, 3rd Earl of Pembroke (1580–1630): ‘I was fain first to send to *Mr. Henry Laws*, who furnishing me with some, directed me for the rest to send into *Germany to Mr. Laneere*, who by his great skill gave a life and a harmony to all that he set’.⁵⁴ Both Lawes and Lanier, clearly, had obtained the Earl’s poems in order to set them to music.

The handsome and virtuous Sidney, like Homer’s Antinous, wooed a Penelope but could not win her. His was fair Penelope Devereux, daughter of Walter, 1st Earl of Essex, generally accepted as the ‘Stella’ in Sidney’s sonnet sequence, *Astrophil and Stella*.⁵⁵ She was unattainable, however, having been married in 1582 to Robert, 3rd Baron Rich, and it is as Lady Rich that she is remembered. All the protagonists in what may have been no more than a highly sophisticated poetic courtship were dead by 1613, but this purest of Elizabethan infatuations remained in the collective memory of Jacobean society. The sense of melancholic remembrance imparted by this portrait may be the product of elements of this romance combined with Classical myth and plaintive Renaissance pastoral.

Sidney’s *Arcadia* begins with memories, as does Markham’s *English Arcadia*, and in Davies’s *Orchestra* the unbearable memories which that ‘heavenly man’, Phæmius, evokes with his lyre (substitute Lanier with lute) force Penelope to interrupt the singing. As Benjamin Hebbert has observed, the musician’s fingers have just left the strings and his mouth remains slightly open; the last note resonates endlessly in the captured moment of the picture. The interruption has come from outside; the musician glances toward the viewer. We assume that this portrait was painted for the sitter to keep, and that Lanier would often gaze at himself, but perhaps the presence of another – a living Penelope – was required to complete the portrait’s matrix of relationships.

* * * *

52. The Countess of Pembroke was stirred to publish the ‘New’ *Arcadia* (1593) after Fulke Greville saw to publication the unrevised ‘Old’ *Arcadia* (1590). For the confused publishing history of the work, see Gavin Alexander, *Writing After Sidney, The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney, 1586-1640*, Oxford, 2006, xiii–xxvii.
53. This work followed on from Markham’s *The English Arcadia*, alluding his beginning to Sir Philip Sydneys ending (1607).
54. Andreas Gebauer, *Von Macht und Mäzenatentum. Leben und Werk William Herberts, des dritten Earls von Pembroke*, Heidelberg, 1987, p. 193. Lanier spent much of the Interregnum on the Continent as a royalist exile. ODNB mentions he was in Holland but not Germany.
55. See Katherine Duncan-Jones, ‘Sidney, Stella, and Lady Rich’, in *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*, eds. J. A. van Dorsten et al. (Brill, 1986), pp. 170–92.